

REMARKS

Claims 1-198 are pending.

Claims 1-35, 82-138 and 184-192 were rejected.

Claim 192 would be allowable if amended to overcome the rejection under
35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 193 -198 were objected to.

Claims 36-81 and 139-183 were allowed.

Claims 8, 26, 31, 32, 36, 38, 46, 48, 51, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 63, 71, 73, 76,
78, 113, 130, 134, 135, 139, 141, 149, 151, 154, 156, 158, 160, 161, 162, 165, 173, 178, 180, 192
and 198 are amended herein. No new matter has been introduced.

Claim 1-7, 29, 30, 82-106, 107-112, 132, 133 and 184-191 are cancelled, without
prejudice.

Claims 199-210 are new. No new matter has been introduced.

I. Declaration

As requested by the Examiner, Applicants are in the process of executing a substitute declaration identifying this application by its Serial Number and filing date. An original Fiduciary's Probate Certificate, appointing Ms. Gaye Gardner as the Legal Representative of the inventor, Gary Gardner, deceased, which contains a raised Seal of the Probate Court thereon, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.42, 1.44 will be enclosed with the substitute declaration. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that when the substitute declaration is received, the Examiner review it with a view toward withdrawing the objection to the declaration.

II. Abstract

As suggested by the Examiner, Applicants have included, on a separate sheet, an Abstract that recites, in a clear and concise manner, the principles of their invention. Accordingly, the Examiner's objection to the disclosure has been overcome.

III. Drawings

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's objection to the drawings. With regard to Claims 89, 92, 97-102, Applicants have requested these claims be cancelled. Accordingly, the Examiner's objection to the drawing is no longer relevant. Applicants have, however, amended Figure 1 to illustrate the subject matter claimed in these claims. More specifically, Figure 1 has been amended to illustrate a postal scale, an optical scanner, a facsimile receiver, a facsimile transmitter and a communication network attached to serial ports 163 and 165. No new matter has been entered. Support for the additions to Figure 1 is found on page 6, lines 1-5, page 6, lines 20-35, page 27, lines 20-36 and in Claim 100. Claim 100 has not been amended and was filed with the original application. Accordingly, no new matter has been introduced in amended Figure 1. A copy of the amended Figure 1, along with a Submission of Proposed Drawing Amendment, is included herein. Amendments to Figure 1 are shown in red pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.121. Applicants will provide formal drawings in due course.

With regard to Claim 88, the subject matter of this claim, -- i.e., "an address cleanser," is a process within processor 155. The details of the processing are well-known in the art and are not necessary for the understanding of Applicants' invention. According, it is respectfully submitted that the reason for the Examiner's objection to the drawing as not illustrating the features claimed in Claim 88 has been overcome.

With regard to Claim 125, Applicants submit that the subject matter of this claim is already illustrated in the drawings and no amendments to the drawings are needed. More specially, the subject matter of Claim 125, -- i.e., "information for identifying at least one party to which said costs are attributed," is illustrated in Figure 8, as "Payer information 801a," and disclosed on page 19, lines 13-23. For the reasons stated herein, the subject matter claimed in Claim 125 is shown to be adequately illustrated in the drawings and disclosed in the specification. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's objection to the drawings as not illustrating the features claimed in Claim 125 has been overcome.

With regard to Claim 192, Applicants submit that the subject matter of this claim is already illustrated in the drawings and no amendments to the drawings are needed. More specifically, the subject matter of Claim 192, --i.e., "[a] method for sending a mail piece ...to inform third party of the information while the mail piece is being sent," is illustrated in Figure 8, as "Special Instructions 801g," and disclosed on page 20, lines 18-29, which state, "[f]ield 801g contains data representing special instructions to the postal authority concerning the transaction," and on page 25, lines 26-30, which state, "[i]t should be noted that during the processing of the mail piece, the postal authority or courier may re-route it to a financial institution for immediate

deposit." Additional details of the subject matter claimed in Claim 192 may be found on page 27, lines 29-36, which state, "[I]t will also be appreciated that mail processor 150 can communicate with a third party certification authority through a communication network to provide verification to the sender that the recipient has (1) received the transmitted data, (2) accessed the transmitted data, and /or (3) converted the transmitted data to plain text."

For the reasons presented herein, the subject matter claimed in Claim 192 is shown to be adequately illustrated in the drawings and disclosed in the specification. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's objection to the drawings as not illustrating the features claimed in Claim 192 has been overcome.

Having amended Figure 1 to illustrate exemplary devices attached to serial ports 163 and 165, and to illustrate a communication network, and having shown that adequate disclosure exists in the specification for Claims 88, 125 and 192, Applicants submit that the reasons for the Examiner's objection to the drawings have been overcome. Applicants respectfully request that amended Figure 1 be entered and that the objection be withdrawn.

VI. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for his indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 36-81 and 139-183 and the indication that Claim 192 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

With regard to base claims 36, 58, 139, and 161, Applicants have amended these claims to indicate that "an indicium" may be generated and the "indicium" includes a transactional data which causes a first party to pay a transaction amount to a second party in response to at least the transactional data. No new matter has been entered as the amendments to these base claims

merely refer to "an indicium" and not "a postal indicium." Dependent claims 38, 46, 48, 51, 53, 55, 56, 57, 59, 61, 63, 71, 73, 76, 78, 141, 149, 151, 154, 156, 158, 160, 162, 165, 173, 175, and 180 are also amended to provide proper antecedent basis for the subject matter claimed. New Claims 201, 202, 203 and 204 have been added to state that the indicium includes a postage amount. Support for these claims was found in base Claims 36, 58, 139 and 161, which previously disclosed a postage indicium. Accordingly, no new matter has been introduced.

As base Claims 36, 58, 139 and 161 were allowable, these same claims, as amended, should also be allowable.

With regard to Claim 192, Applicants have endeavored to point out the subject matter Applicants regard as their invention, as stated below. More specifically, Applicants have shown those sections of the specification which provide proper antecedent basis for Claim 192. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 192 is allowable, as are Claims 193 - 198, which depend from Claim 192. Similarly, new claims 199, 200 and 210 which have been added and ultimately depend from Claim 192 are also allowable. Claim 200 includes language that was found in Claim 192. Support for Claim 210 may be found in the specification on page 17, lines 29-36 and page 18, lines 1-11. Claim 199 includes language that was found in Claim 198.

V. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph Rejection

Claims 88, 89, 91, 92, 94, 95, 97-102, 125 and 192 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention. The Examiner contends that "[t]he subject matter of Claims 88, 89, 91, 92, 94, 95, 97-102, 125 and 192 lacks antecedent basis within the specification." (See Office Action, page 4, section 7).

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's contention. Although, Applicants has requested Claims 82-106 be cancelled, without prejudice, Applicants have endeavored to show where support for the claim language may be found in the specification. In the event that the language of the specification is not clear, Applicants have amended the specification to include specific claim language within the specification.

With regard to Claim 88, this claim claims "a system ... further comprising an address cleanser for checking address information ..." Support for the subject matter claimed is found on page 27, lines 5 -9, which state, "[I]n addition, it will be appreciated that mail processor 150 will incorporate a well-known address cleansing capability for matching, verifying and correcting the sender and recipient addresses and their zip codes." Accordingly, adequate disclosure exists in the specification for an address cleanser as claimed in Claim 88.

With regard to Claim 89, this claim claims "a second interface for obtaining shipping rate information." Support for the subject matter claimed is found in amended Figure 1, and in the specification on page 27, lines 10 - 15, which state "mail processor 150 may allow the user to obtain shipping rates of different couriers (e.g. UPS, FedEx and USPS)." Accordingly, adequate disclosure exists in the specification, as amended, to support the subject matter claimed in Claim 89.

With regard to Claim 91, this claim claims "a second interface for establishing a connection to a communication network." Support for the subject matter claimed is found in amended Figure 1 and on page 27, lines 29-32, which state "[I]t will be appreciated that mail processor 150 can communicate with ... through a communication network (e.g., the Internet)." Accordingly, adequate disclosure exists in the specification for the subject matter claimed in Claim 91.

With regard to Claim 92, this claim claims "said communication network includes at least part of the Internet." Support for this claim is found in amended Figure 1, and in the specification on page 27, lines 29-32, which state "[I]t will be appreciated that mail processor 150 can communicate with ... through a communication network (e.g., the Internet)." Accordingly, adequate disclosure exists in the specification, as amended, to support the subject matter claimed in Claim 92.

With regard to Claim 94, this claim claims "communicator communicates with a certification authority other than the selected recipient." Support for the subject matter claimed is found in the specification on page 27, lines 29-36, which state, "[I]t will also be appreciated that mail processor 150 can communicate with a third party certification authority through a communication network to provide verification to the sender that the recipient has (1) received the transmitted data, (2) accessed the transmitted data, and /or (3) converted the transmitted data to plain text." Accordingly, adequate disclosure exists in the specification to support the subject matter claimed in Claim 94.

With regard to Claims 97-102, Applicants have amended the specification, on page 6, lines 1- 4 to read "serial interfaces 163 and 165 for connection with devices such as a conventional optical scanner 114 (e.g., a bar-code scanner), and facsimile devices 116 for transmission and receiving material, and postage scale 112 and PCMCIA or serial (PCMCIA/serial) interface 167 for interfacing with IC card 180, and printer parallel interface 169 for connection with printer 190." Facsimile transmission and receiving language may be found in Claims 97 and 100, which claim a transmitting facsimile and a receiving facsimile, respectively. As claims 97, and 100 have not been amended, the claim language contained therein was included in the original specification. Accordingly, no new matter has been introduced.

Support for Claim 97, is also found in the specification on page 27, line 20-21, which state, "mail processor 150 may be capable of printing bar-coded digital signatures on the material to be facsimile-transmitted." Accordingly, adequate disclosure exists in the specification to support the subject matter claimed in Claim 97.

With regard to Claim 98 and 99, support for the subject matter claimed is found in the specification on page 27, lines 22-25, which state "[i]t can transmit data with an appropriate digital signature using an encryption algorithm." Accordingly, adequate disclosure exists in the specification to support the subject matter claimed in Claim 98 and 99

With regard to Claim 101, support for the subject matter claimed is found in the specification on amended page 27, lines 22-25, which state "[i]t can also scan or digitally read facsimile-transmitted material at its destination using ... cryptography to authenticate the transmission for the recipient." Hence, the facsimile receiver is able to decrypt the encrypted transmitted message. Accordingly, adequate disclosure exists in the specification to support the subject matter claimed in Claim 101.

With regard to Claim 102, support for the subject matter claimed is found in the specification on amended page 27, lines 22-25, which state "[i]t can also scan or digitally read facsimile-transmitted material at its destination using ... cryptography to authenticate the transmission for the recipient." Hence, the facsimile receiver is able to decrypt and verify the encrypted transmitted message. Accordingly, adequate disclosure exists in the specification to support the subject matter claimed in Claim 102.

With regard to Claim 125, this claim claims "information for identifying at least one party to which said costs are attributed is derived from said data." As previously discussed, support for the subject matter of Claim 125 is illustrated in Figure 8, as "Payer information 801a," and disclosed on page 19, lines 13-23., which state "[i]n particular, ... fields 801a

contains data identifying the payer and particularly data identifying the payer account." Accordingly, adequate disclosure exists in the specification to support the subject matter claimed in Claim 125.

With regard to Claim 192, this claim claims "[a] method for sending a mail piece ... to inform a third party of the information while the mail piece is being sent." As previously discussed, support for the subject matter of Claim 192 is illustrated in Figure 8, as "Special Instructions 801g," and disclosed on page 20, lines 18-29, which state, "[f]ield 801g contains data representing special instructions to the postal authority concerning the transaction," and on page 25, lines 26-30, which state, "[i]t should be noted that during the processing of the mail piece, the postal authority or courier may re-route it to a financial institution for immediate deposit." Additional details of the subject matter claimed in Claim 192 may be found on page 27, lines 29-36, which state, "[I]t will also be appreciated that mail processor 150 can communicate with a third party certification authority through a communication network to provide verification to the sender that the recipient has (1) received the transmitted data, (2) accessed the transmitted data, and /or (3) converted the transmitted data to plain text." Accordingly, adequate disclosure exists in the specification to support the subject matter claimed in Claim 192.

For the reasons stated herein, Applicants have shown that there is adequate support in the specification for the subject matter claimed in Claims 88, 89, 92, 94, 97-102, 125 and 192. Applicants submit that the reasons for the Examiner's rejections of the claims have been overcome and can no longer be sustained. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and Claims 125 and 192 be allowed.

VI. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-7, 8-35, 82-106, 107-138 and 184-191 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) and § 102 (e). More specifically, Claims 1-7, 82-106 and 184-191 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by either Wright *et al.* (U.S. Patents 4, 802, 218 or 4, 900, 903 or 4,900, 904) or Talmadge (U.S. Patents 4, 809, 185 or 4, 858, 138) or Freytag (U.S. Patent 5, 490,077). Claims 1-7, 82-106 and 184-191 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by either Freytag (U.S. Patent 5, 602, 743) or Lee *et al.* (U.S. Patent 5, 625, 694) or Arsenault *et al.* (U.S. Patent 5, 661, 103). Claims 8-35 and 107-138 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by either Fougere, *et al.* (U.S. Patent 4, 743, 747) or Pastor (U.S. Patents 4, 853, 961 or 4, 893, 338) or Sansone, *et al.* (U.S. Patents 4, 831, 555 or 4, 837, 701 or 4, 947, 333) or Hart *et al.* (U.S. Patent 4, 853, 864) or Gilham (U.S. Patent 4, 934, 846). Claims 8-35 and 107-138 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Manduely (U.S. Patent 5, 650, 934).

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's reasons for rejecting the claims. However, in response, Applicants have cancelled Claims 1-7, 29, 30, 82-106, 107-112, 132, 133 and 184-191, without prejudice, and have amended base Claims 8, 26, 113, and 130. More specifically, Claims 8 and 113 have been amended to state that the indicium is generated at the same time as the mail content. Claim 26 has been amended to include the subject matter of Claims 29 and 30 and Claim 130, has been amended to include the subject matter of Claims 132 and 133.

With regard to Claim 1-7, it is the Examiner's position that any one of the cited references "disclose a postage metering system in which attributes of an item of mail are used to determine the appropriate postage. Then postage security device, e.g., a separate module, is used to

approve the required postage and if approved then a postage indicia and proof of payment are generated and printed on the item of mail so as to be visible to the mail processing equipment." (See Office Action, Section 9.6). As stated previously, Applicants disagree with the Examiner's position, but have requested these claims be cancelled, without prejudice. Accordingly, the reasons for the Examiner's rejection of these claims are no longer relevant.

With regard to Claims 8-25 and claims 107-112 and 113-129, the Examiner rejected these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated in view of the cited references. It is the Examiner's position that any one of the cited references "disclose a postage metering system in which attributes of an item of mail are used to determine the appropriate postage. Then if the required postage is approved a postage indicia and proof of payment are generated and printed on the item of mail so as to be visible to the mail processing equipment." (See Office Action, Section 9.3). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's position. However, with regard to Claims 107-112, Applicants have requested these claims be cancelled, without prejudice. Hence, with regard to Claims 107-112, the Examiner's rejection of these claims is no longer relevant.

With regard to base Claims 8 and 113, Applicants have amended these claims to state that the mail content and indicium are printed contemporaneously. Support for the amendment to Claims 8 and 113 is found on page 9, lines 20 - 24, which state, "the step of generation and application of a postage indicium is made part of the mail content generation step. Specifically, the mail content is printed at the same time as the postage indicium." Accordingly, no new matter has been introduced.

Applicants invention, as claimed in independent Claim 8, as amended, recites an apparatus for generating content of a mail piece that includes a processor responsive to received

data for computing the cost of delivering the mail piece and generating an output for applying contemporaneously -- *i.e.*, at the same time, an indication that is indicative of the cost "onto the content" of the mail piece. Independent Claim 113, recites a method for generating and applying, contemporaneously, an indication that is indicative of the cost "onto the content" of the mail piece.

Fougere ('747) discloses a system of encrypting a postal indicia to allow for verification of the postal indicia. Fougere does not claim the element of "contemporaneously applying the indication, indicative of the cost, onto the mail piece content," as claimed in Applicants' invention. Accordingly, Fougere does not anticipate Applicants' invention.

Pastor ('961) discloses a system for reliably authenticating a document that includes using a cipher key double lock. Pastor does not consider applying indicia onto the mail piece content and considers only scanning indicia on envelopes to authenticate the indicia placed thereon. (See, Col. 2, lines 53-55, which state, "[c]urrently, the USPS accepts the indicia on an envelope applied by a mailer ...". Also, see Col. 2, lines 62-66, which state, "[a]t the present time, postage meters apply the indicia to an envelope via a mechanical printing means ... or via impressing of platen upon an envelope."). Pastor does not claim the element of "contemporaneously applying the indication, indicative of the cost, onto the mail piece content," as claimed in Applicants' invention. Accordingly, Pastor does not anticipate Applicants' invention.

Pastor ('338) discloses a system for conveying information for the reliable authentication of a plurality of documents. According to Pastor ('338), a system for postage may be authenticated by checking the indicia on N envelopes rather than all the envelopes. (See Col. 5, lines 61-64, which state "[i]n order to reduce the number of characters ... printed on each envelope a number N is chosen. The number N represents the number of envelopes that must be accumulated by the USPS."). Pastor does not claim the element of "contemporaneously applying

the indication, indicative of the cost, onto the mail piece content," as claimed in Applicants' invention. Accordingly, Pastor does not anticipate Applicants' invention.

Sansone ('555) discloses a unsecure system for applying postage that uses a printer and accounting unit that are separated from one another by an unsecure link. The system uses encryption techniques to provide security to prevent the printer from printing unaccounted postage. Sansone does not claim the element of "contemporaneously applying the indication, indicative of the cost, onto the mail piece content," as claimed in Applicants' invention. Accordingly, Sansone does not anticipate Applicants' invention.

Sansone ('701) discloses a system for processing batch mail that renders on-site inspection unnecessary. In accordance with Sansone, a mail sender purchases postage from a central station, which authorizes the mail sender to send mail equal to the amount of postage purchased. A statement of the postage used is generated and accompanies batches of mail to a central station for processing. Sansone does not claim the element of "contemporaneously applying the indication, indicative of the cost, onto the mail piece content," as claimed in Applicants' invention. Accordingly, Sansone does not anticipate Applicants' invention.

Sansone ('333) discloses a system for processing batch mail that renders on-site inspection unnecessary. In accordance with Sansone ('333), a system for processing batch mail is disclosed, which prints the appropriate postage, time date transaction number and address on the mail pieces for a particular run. This run is given a number that is associated with the particular mail to be sent. The number will be printed on the envelopes of that run. (See Col. 6, lines 46-49, which state, "[r]eferring now to FIG. 3, an envelope is shown as it would be prepared by the present system . The upper left hand corner contains the address of the mail sender and the upper right hand corner contains a pre-print block contain the class of mail ..."). Sansone does not claim the element of "contemporaneously applying the indication, indicative of

the cost, onto the mail piece content," as claimed in Applicants' invention. Accordingly, Sansone does not anticipate Applicants' invention.

Hart discloses a system for processing batch mail that renders on-site inspection unnecessary. Similar to the device of Sansone, the Hart device prints on mail pieces, such as envelopes. (See Col. 3, lines 56-60). Hart does not claim the element of "contemporaneously applying the indication, indicative of the cost, onto the mail piece content," as claimed in Applicants' invention. Accordingly, Hart does not anticipate Applicants' invention.

Gilham discloses a method of franking mail items by generating a pseudo-random number relating the franking transaction and impresses the pseudo-random number on the mailing item. Gilham does not claim the element of "contemporaneously applying the indication, indicative of the cost, onto the mail piece content," as claimed in Applicants' invention. Accordingly, Gilham does not anticipate Applicants' invention.

Manduley discloses a method of producing mail pieces using a first printer to print documents and a second printer for printing envelopes. Manduley does not claim the element of "contemporaneously applying the indication, indicative of the cost, onto the mail piece content," as claimed in Applicants' invention. Accordingly, Manduley does not anticipate Applicants' invention.

Having shown that none of the cited references claim the elements of the present invention, Applicants submit that their invention, as claimed in Claims 8 and 113, is patently distinct from, and not anticipated by, the cited references. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and these claims allowed.

With regard to Claims 9-25 and 114-129, these claims ultimately depend from and include all the subject matter of independent Claims 8 and 113, respectively, which have been

shown to be allowable. Accordingly, Claims 9-25 and 114-129 are also allowable based on their dependency from these allowable independent claims. Applicants, therefore, request that the rejection be withdrawn and these claims be allowed.

With regard to Claim 26-35 and Claims 130-138, the Examiner rejected these claims for the same reasons as were recited in rejecting Claims 8-25 and 113-129. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's reason for rejection. However, Applicants have amended base Claim 26 by including the subject matter of dependent Claims 29 and 30, therein, and base Claim 130 by incorporating the subject matter of dependent Claims 133 and 134, therein. No new matter has been entered as dependent Claims 29, 30, 133 and 134 have not been amended and were filed with the original application.

Claim 26, as amended, claims an apparatus that includes an interface to obtain selected information appearing on the mail piece and a processor that is responsive to the selected information for determining whether postage is dispensed for delivery. The processor inhibits postage from being dispensed if the originator is not authorized to dispense postage. Claim 130, claims a method of dispensing postage by obtaining selected information from a mail piece and determining, in response to at least the selected information, whether postage is dispensed. When it is determined that the originator of the mail piece is not authorized to dispense postage, then postage is not dispensed.

As previously discussed in regard to Claims 8 and 113, the cited references disclose methods and apparatus for printing indicium onto mail piece covers. None of the cited references contain the element of obtaining information from selected data and inhibiting dispensement of the required postal funds if the originator is not authorized for such dispensement. Accordingly, Applicants' invention is not anticipated by any of the cited

references as none of the cited references contain the element of "obtaining selected information from the mail piece" and "disallowing a dispensation ... when the originator is determined to be unauthorized."

For the reasons stated herein, Applicants' invention is not anticipated by the cited references because the cited references do not contain the elements of Applicants' invention. Accordingly, the reasons for the Examiner's rejection of Claims 26 and 130 have been overcome. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and Claims 26 and 130 be allowed.

With regard to Claims 27-35 and 131-138, these claims ultimately depend from and include all the subject matter of independent Claims 26 and 130, respectively, which have been shown to be allowable. Accordingly, Claims 27-35 and 131-138 are also allowable based on their dependency from these allowable independent claims. Applicants, therefore, request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

With regard to Claims 82-106 and 184-191, the Examiner recited the same reasons for rejecting these claims as were recited in rejecting Claims 1-7. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's reasons for rejecting these claims. However, Applicants have requested these claims be cancelled, without prejudice. Accordingly, the Examiner's reasons for rejecting these claims are no longer relevant.

Based on the amendments to the claims and the remarks made, herein, Applicant submits that the reasons for the Examiner's rejection of the claims have been overcome and can no longer

be sustained. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

VII. Summary

Having fully addressed the Examiner's reasons for objections and rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and 35 U.S.C. § 102, it is believed that in view of the amendments made to Figure 1, to the specification, and to the claims, and the preceding remarks made herein, that this entire application stands in a condition for allowance. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number below, in order that any outstanding issues may be resolved without the necessity of issuing a further Opinion.

VIII. Petition For Extension of Time and Fees

Applicants respectfully petition for a two-month extension of time in which to file this Amendment. A check in the amount \$380.00 dollars to cover the cost of same is attached hereto.



Serial No. 08/973, 293

Serial No. 08/973,293

filed: 12/01/97

If an additional fee is required with this Amendment, please charge deposit account #16-1350. A duplicate of this last page is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

RECEIVED
AUG - 2 2000
TECH CENTER 2700

David Aker

David Aker (Reg. No. 29,277)

JULY 18, 2000

Date

PERMAN & GREEN, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06430
(203) 259-1800 x108

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail on the date shown below in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231.

JULY 18, 2000

Date

David Aker

Name of Person Making Deposit